UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,748	10/14/2003	Edmund J. Fish	AOL0144	6173

22862 7590 11/09/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
COLAN, GIOVANNA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/685,748	**Applicant(s)** FISH ET AL.
	Examiner Giovanna Colan	**Art Unit** 2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 08/31/2006.

2. Claims 1 –17 were amended. No claims were canceled. Claims 18 – 20 were added.

3. This action is made Final.

4. Claims 1 – 20 are pending in this application.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim 1 – 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, which was necessitated by the amendment filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 12, and 15 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohli (Kohli hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,442,544 B1, issued: August 27, 2002) in view of DeLorme et al. (DeLorme hereinafter) (US Patent No. 5,948,040, issued: September 7, 1999).

Regarding Claim 1, Kohli discloses a system for responding to a search query from a user who uses a wireless device (Col. 3, lines 64 – 65, Kohli), said wireless device being communicatively coupled via a wireless communication system to a server on the Internet (Col. 3, lines 50 – 51, Kohli), said server comprising:

a processor on which a search engine application runs (Col.3, lines 59 – 63, server suite, Kohli),

said processor being configured to:

extract the user's geographic location information from the signals carrying the search query (Fig. 2A, items 31 and 32, Col. 4, lines 27 – 30, Kohli);

However, Kohli is silent with respect to automatically extracting such user's geographic location information without requiring the user to enter said geographic location information. On the other hand, DeLorme discloses a system and method that automatically extracts the user's geographic location information from the signals carrying the search query without requiring the user to enter said geographic location information (Fig.9B, item 907, 939, Col. 10 and 72, lines 34 – 38 and 2 – 7; respectively, DeLorme). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the DeLorme's teachings to the system Kohli. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by DeLorme (Col. 11, lines 25 – 28 and 40 – 45, DeLorme), to provide a customized or individualized system that is applicable when a user seeks to make a travel information inquiries while en route; e.g., from a remote location such as moving vehicle. Such inquiries include: requests for emergency services, immediate reservations for lodging, meals, or transportation connections, or travel directions. In addition, both of the references (Kohli and DeLorme) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, databases management systems, searching information according to user's geographic location information, and wireless communication. This close relation between both of the references highly suggests an expectation of success.

The combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme further discloses:

calculate a set of reference parameters based on the user's geographic location information (Fig.2A, item 33, Col. 4, lines 30 – 32, Kohli; and Col. 73, lines 8 – 17, travel plan inquiries, DeLorme);

set one or more filtering parameters for said search engine application, said filtering parameters being associated with said reference parameters (Col. 6, lines 16 – 18, city list, virtual city list, friendly name list, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 6 – 12, data packets ... get parsed, DeLorme), said search engine application comparing said filtering parameters against the corresponding parameters contained in the geographic location information identifying each search object (Fig. 11, item 120, 121, and 122, Col. 6, lines 20 – 23, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 15 – 22, DeLorme) and ranking relevant search objects by the distance between the user's geographic location and the geographic location associated with each relevant search object (Col. 4 and 6, lines 35 – 38 and 48 – 49; respectively, Kohli[1]); and

return search results to the user via said wireless communication system (Col. 3, and 4, lines 49 – 53, and 48 – 53, such as the Internet; respectively, Kohli; and Col. 71 and 72, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, respectively, DeLorme).

Regarding Claim 2, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a system, wherein said wireless device comprises a graphical user interface which is used to enter and send said search query and display said returned search results (Fig. 2A and 2B, items 31 – 32 and 36, Col. 4, lines 27 – 35, Kohli).

Regarding Claim 3, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a system, wherein said graphical user interface comprises a sorting means (Col. 2, lines 54 – 57, received back search categories organized by an area of a town or city corresponding to that geographical location, Kohli) which is used to re-sort said returned search results by a predefined category (Col. 6, lines 41 – 45, Kohli[2]).

---

[1] In addition, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme also discloses this in the following citation: (Col. 4, and 5, lines 35 – 38, and 41 – 54; respectively, Kohli). Wherein the location descriptor corresponds to the user's geographic location claimed; and wherein the search categories to the user corresponds to the relevant search object claimed.

Regarding Claim 7, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a system, wherein said graphical user interface is coupled to a full Web browser (Col. 5, lines 42 – 43, Kohli).

Regarding Claim 8, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a system, wherein said set of reference parameters comprises any of:

one or more telephone area codes (Fig.2B, Col. 6, lines 35 – 36, Directory and Yellow Pages, Kohli);

one or more zip codes (Fig.2A, ZIP Code, Kohli);

the coordinates of the user's geographic location relative to a receiving station of said wireless communication system (Fig.12, item 127, Col. 6, lines 41 – 44, Kohli); and

a predetermined distance as a reference radius of a search region (Col.6, lines 41 – 43, Kohli[3]).

Regarding Claim 9, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method for responding to a search query from a user who uses a wireless device, said wireless device being communicatively coupled via a wireless communication system to a server on the Internet, the method comprising the steps of:

---

[2] Wherein the step of increasing by some metric and redoing the search corresponds to resorting the

automatically extracting the user's geographic location information from the signals carrying the search query (Fig. 2A, items 31 and 32, Col. 4, lines 27 – 30, Kohli) without requiring the user to enter said geographic location information (Fig.9B, item 907, 939, Col. 10 and 72, lines 34 – 38 and 2 – 7; respectively, DeLorme);

calculating a set of reference parameters based on the user's geographic location information (Fig. 2A, item 33, Col. 4, lines 30 – 32, Kohli; and Col. 73, lines 8 – 17, travel plan inquiries, DeLorme);

setting filtering parameters, based on said reference parameters, for a search engine application running on said server (Col. 3 and 6, lines 49 – 51 and 16 – 18, city list, virtual city list, friendly name list, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 6 – 12, data packets ... get parsed, DeLorme);

comparing said filtering parameters against the corresponding parameters contained in the geographic location information identifying each search object (Fig. 11, item 120, 121, and 122, Col. 6, lines 20 – 23, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 15 – 22, DeLorme); and

returning search results to the user via said wireless communication system (Col. 3, and 4, lines 49 – 53, and 48 – 53, such as the Internet; respectively, Kohli; and Col. 71 and 72, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, respectively, DeLorme).

Regarding Claim 10, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method, further comprising the step of:

---

search results.

ranking relevant search objects by the distance between the user's geographic location and the geographic location associated with each relevant search object (Col. 4 and 6, lines 35 – 38 and 48 – 49; respectively, Kohli[4]).

Regarding Claim 11, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method, wherein said wireless device comprises a graphical user interface which is used to enter and send said search query and display said returned search results (Fig. 2A and 2B, items 31 – 32 and 36, Col. 4, lines 27 – 35, Kohli).

Regarding Claim 12, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method, further comprising the step of:

re-sorting said returned search results using a sorting means based on a predefined category (Col. 6, lines 41 – 45, Kohli[5]), said sorting means being coupled to said graphical user interface (Col. 2, lines 54 – 57, received back search categories organized by an area of a town or city corresponding to that geographical location, Kohli).

Regarding Claim 16, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method, wherein said graphical user interface is coupled to a full Web browser (Col. 5, lines 42 – 43, Kohli).

---

[3] Wherein the search radius before is increased corresponds to the predetermined distance claimed.

[4] In addition, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme also discloses this in the following citation: (Col. 4, and 5, lines 35 – 38, and 41 – 54; respectively, Kohli). Wherein the location descriptor corresponds to the user's geographic location claimed; and wherein the search categories to the user corresponds to the relevant search object claimed.

Regarding Claim 17, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a method, wherein said set of reference parameters comprises any of:

one or more telephone area codes (Fig. 2B, Col. 6, lines 35 – 36, Directory and Yellow Pages, Kohli);

one or more zip codes (Fig. 2A, ZIP Code, Kohli);

the coordinates of the user's geographic location relative to a receiving station of said wireless communication system (Fig. 12, item 127, Col. 6, lines 41 – 44, Kohli); and

a predetermined distance as a reference radius of a search region (Col. 6, lines 41 – 43, Kohli[6]).

Regarding Claim 18, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a computer readable medium containing a computer program product for responding to a search query from a user who uses a wireless device, said wireless device being communicatively coupled via a wireless communication system to a server on the Internet, the computer program product comprising:

program code for automatically extracting the user's geographic location information from the signals carrying the search query (Fig. 2A, items 31 and 32, Col. 4, lines 27 – 30, Kohli) without requiring the user to enter said geographic location information (Fig.9B, item 907, 939, Col. 10 and 72, lines 34 – 38 and 2 – 7; respectively, DeLorme),

---

[5] Wherein the step of increasing by some metric and redoing the search corresponds to resorting the

program code for calculating a set of reference parameters based on the user's geographic location Information (Fig. 2A, item 33, Col. 4, lines 30 – 32, Kohli; and Col. 73, lines 8 – 17, travel plan inquiries, DeLorme);

program code for setting filtering parameters, based on said reference parameters, for a search engine application running on said server (Col. 3 and 6, lines 49 – 51 and 16 – 18, city list, virtual city list, friendly name list, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 6 – 12, data packets ... get parsed, DeLorme);

program code for comparing said filtering parameters against the corresponding parameters contained in the geographic location information identifying each search object (Fig. 11, item 120, 121, and 122, Col. 6, lines 20 – 23, Kohli; and Col. 75, lines 15 – 22, DeLorme); and

program code for returning search results to the user via said wireless communication system (Col. 3, and 4, lines 49 – 53, and 48 – 53, such as the Internet; respectively, Kohli; and Col. 71 and 72, lines 64 – 67 and 1 – 2, respectively, DeLorme).

Regarding Claim 19, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a computer program product further comprising:

program code for ranking relevant search objects by the distance between the user's geographic location and the geographic location associated with each relevant search object (Col. 4 and 6, lines 35 – 38 and 48 – 49; respectively, Kohli[7]).

---

search results.

[6] Wherein the search radius before is increased corresponds to the predetermined distance claimed.

[7] In addition, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme also discloses this in the following citation: (Col. 4, and 5, lines 35 – 38, and 41 – 54; respectively, Kohli). Wherein the location descriptor corresponds to

Regarding Claim 20, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses a computer program product, wherein said wireless device comprises a graphical user interface which is used to enter and send said

search query and display said returned search results (Fig. 2A and 2B, items 31 – 32 and 36, Col. 4, lines 27 – 35, Kohli).

9. **Claim 4 – 5, and 13 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohli (Kohli hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,442,544 B1, issued: August 27, 2002), in view of DeLorme et al. (DeLorme hereinafter) (US Patent No. 5,948,040, issued: September 7, 1999), and further in view of Kim et al. (Kim hereinafter) (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0208482 A1, filed: November 6, 2003).**

Regarding Claim 4, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses all the limitations as disclosed above including predefined categories, such as, by distance (Col. 2, lines 56, organized by an area of a town, Kohli); by alphabet (Fig. 2B, All categories: A, B,, X, Y, Z, Kohli). However, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme is silent with respect to a predefined category by rating. On the other hand, Kim discloses rating by relevance of objects in a search engine (Page 2, [0016], lines 7 – 8 and 10 – 14, Kim). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the Kim's teachings to the system of the

---

the user's geographic location claimed; and wherein the search categories to the user corresponds to the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Kim (Page 2, [0017], lines 1 – 7, Kim), to provide a general – purpose search engine a method to rank pages without limitation to topic according to the quality of individual pages; and to present the search results in such a way that the most relevant results appear on the top of the list. In addition, the applied references (Kohli, DeLorme, and Kim) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, databases management systems and search engines. This close relation between the applied references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 5, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Kim discloses a system of claim 4, wherein a default category for said sorting means is by distance (Col. 2, lines 54 – 57, received back search categories organized by an area of a town or city corresponding to that geographical location, Kohli[8]).

Regarding Claim 13, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Kim discloses a method, wherein said predefined category is any of:

by distance (Col. 2, lines 56, organized by an area of a town, Kohli);

by alphabet (Fig. 2B, All categories: A, B,, X, Y, Z, Kohli); and

by rating (Page 2, [0016], lines 7 – 8 and 10 – 14, Kim).

---

relevant search object claimed.

Regarding Claim 14, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Kim discloses a method, wherein a default category for said sorting means is by distance (Col. 2, lines 54 – 57, received back search categories organized by an area of a town or city corresponding to that geographical location, Kohli[9]).

10. Claim 6 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohli (Kohli hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,442,544 B1, issued: August 27, 2002), in view of DeLorme et al. (DeLorme hereinafter) (US Patent No. 5,948,040, issued: September 7, 1999), and further in view of Ukelson (Ukelson hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,338,096 B1, issued: January 8,2002).

Regarding Claim 6, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses all the limitations as disclosed above including a graphical user interface coupled to a web browser (Col. 5, lines 42 – 43, Kohli). However, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme is silent with respect to a micro Web browser. On the other hand, Ukelson discloses a micro Web browser (Col. 4, lines 3 – 5, Ukelson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Ukelson's teachings to the system of the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by Ukelson (Col. 3, lines 63 – 65, Ukelson), to access information utilizing protocols other that

---

[8] Examiner interprets the sorting by distance to be the default category because it is based on a geographic descriptor.
[9] Examiner interprets the sorting by distance to be the default category because it is based on a geographic descriptor.

Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP). In addition, the applied references (Kohli, DeLorme, and Ukelson) teach features that are directed to analogous art and they are directed to the same field of endeavor, such as, search engines. This close relation between the applied references highly suggests an expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 15, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Ukelson discloses a method, wherein said graphical user interface is coupled to a micro Web browser (Col. 4, lines 3 – 5, Ukelson).

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; “automatic extraction of location information from the signal itself, as opposed to requiring the user to enter his or her location”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme does disclose the newly added limitation of: automatic extraction of location information from the signal itself, as opposed to requiring the user to enter his or her location (Fig. 2A, items 31 and 32, Col. 4, lines 27 – 30, Kohli; and Fig.9B, item 907, 939, Col. 10 and 72, lines 34 – 38 and 2 – 7; respectively, DeLorme; see rejections of Claim 1, 9, and 18 as discussed above in this Office Action).

2. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; “wireless device communication and ranking relevant search objects by the distance between the user's geographic location and the geographic location associated with each relevant search object”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme does disclose: wireless device communication (Col. 3, lines 49 – 53, such as the Internet, Kohli) and ranking relevant search objects by the distance between the user's geographic location and the geographic location associated with each relevant search object (Col. 4, and 5, lines 35 – 38, and 41 – 54; respectively, Kohli). Wherein the location descriptor corresponds to the user's geographic location claimed; and wherein the search categories to the user corresponds to the relevant search object claimed. The combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme further discloses more details with respect to the step of ranking relevant search objects (Fig. 8, item 96, Col. 5, lines 49 – 52; wherein the step of organizing by actual location of the geographic descriptor corresponds to the step of ranking as claimed; Kohli). Additionally, the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme discloses "an ordered list" (Col. 6, lines 16 – 23, Kohli), which also emphasizes the step of ranking relevant search objects as claimed.

3. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; "any type of wireless communication at all, much less the specific device communication limitations recited in claim 1".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme does disclose: wireless communication system as disclosed in claim 1 (Col. 3, lines 49 – 53, such as the Internet, Kohli).

4. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; "a motivation to combine the combination of Kohli and Kim, and that such hypothetical combination would disclose or suggest the claimed limitations".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in this office action above, the applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Particularly, there is a motivation for the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Kim (See - 103 rejection of claim 4 – 5, and 13 – 14 as discussed in this Office Action above).

5. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to disclose; " motivation to combine the combination of Kohli and Ukelson, and that such hypothetical combination would disclose or suggest the claimed limitations"

Examiner respectfully disagrees. A stated in this office action above, the applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Particularly, there is a motivation for the combination of Kohli in view of DeLorme and further in view of Ukelson (See – 103 rejection of claim 6 and 15 in this Office Action above).

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

2. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prior Art Made Of Record

1. Kohli (US Patent No. 6,442,544 B1, issued: August 27, 2002) discloses a system and method for organizing search categories for use in an online search query engine based on geographic descriptions.

2. Kim et al. (US Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0208482 A1, filed: November 6, 2003) discloses systems and methods of retrieving relevant information.

3. Ukelson (US Patent No. 6,338,096 B1, issued: January 8,2002) discloses system uses kernels of micro web server for supporting HTML Web browser in providing HTML data format and HTTP protocol from variety of data sources.

4. Nye (US Patent Pub. App. No. 2004/0064334 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for providing geographically authenticated electronic documents.

Points Of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Giovanna Colan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2752. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

G.C.
Giovanna Colan
Examiner
Art Unit 2162
October 31, 2006

Sara AL-Hashem